

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present Amendment is responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed June 24, 2008 in the above-identified application.

Claims 6-10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, claims 1-5 are the claims currently pending in the present application.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify features recited thereby. These amendments are fully supported by applicant's disclosure. Further, claims 2-5 are amended to conform them more closely to U.S. patent practice style.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and receipt of the priority document. Further, applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on April 20, 2006 and July 28, 2006. With respect to the IDS filed April 20, 2006, applicant understands the vertical line extending underneath the initials of the Examiner to be indicating that the Examiner has reviewed and considered each of the six references next to whose listing the vertical line extends. If this is not the case, the Examiner is respectfully requested to state so in the next Office correspondence.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Aoki Kota, Japan Patent Application Publication No. 2001/339211 in view of Takashi, Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2001-069029. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Without intending to limit the scope of the claims, according to an aspect of applicant's invention as claimed in claim 1, an antenna and an antenna rotating shaft are provided which are supported by the card case of the card device such that forces that tend to bend the circuit board or the connection of the circuit board with the antenna shaft are mitigated or suppressed and such that a space on the circuit board for connecting with the antenna shaft is minimized.

Claim 1 requires a card case device including an antenna feed terminal, a card case, and a part for supporting the antenna rotating shaft positioned on an inner wall surface of the card case such that an inner portion of the antenna rotating shaft which is inside of the card

case is supported within the card case in such a manner that the inner portion of the antenna rotating shaft is apart from the circuit board and is freely rotatable.

Kota discloses an antenna system that has a 360 degree rotation structure with mechanical strength and is thin and compact (Kota, Abstract), the antenna having a rotation axis part 1 such that a hold part 4 secures the antenna element 1 to the housing of a portable radio device and a feeding metal fixture transmits electrical power to the antenna element (Kota, Abstract).

Kota does not disclose or suggest a part for supporting the antenna rotating shaft with an inner portion inside the case supported within the card case in such a manner that the inner portion of the antenna rotating shaft is apart from the circuit board, as required by claim 1. Thus, Kota does not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1.

Takashi discloses a portable radio terminal having an antenna section and a printed circuit board in a main body, the antenna section 1 having a shaft section 4a, and a bearing section 5 that is mounted on the printed circuit board 3 with an elastic piece 5a always pressed into contact with part of the shaft section 4a independently of a turning angle of the antenna section (Takashi, Abstract).

Takashi does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kota as they relate to the above-noted features of claim 1. Therefore, even taken together in combination, Kota and Takashi do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 and 4 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons. Claims 6, 8 and 10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and therefore the rejection is moot as to these claims.

Rejection of Claims 3, 5, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Kota in view of Shinichi, Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 2000/252719. Claims 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious from Kota in view of Keizo, Japanese Patent Application Publication No. 10-224046. Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Shinichi does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kota as they relate to the above-noted features of claim 1. Therefore, even taken together in combination, Kota and

Shinichi do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, since claim 3 depends from claim 1, it is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.


Keizo does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kota as they relate to the above-noted features of claim 1. Therefore, even taken together in combination, Kota and Keizo do not disclose or suggest the recitations of claim 1. Accordingly, since claim 5 depends from claim 1, it is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the same reasons.

Claims 7 and 9 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and therefore the rejection is moot as to these claims.

In view of the foregoing discussion, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING
SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY
THROUGH THE PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING
SYSTEM ON **November 10, 2008**.

JAF:GB:ns


Respectfully submitted,

James A. Finder
Registration No.: 30,173
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700